## **United States Court of Appeals**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

<del></del>		
No. 08-2490		
Darnell Allen Browder,	*	
Dlointiff	*	
Plaintiff,	*	
Darryl Browder,	*	
y	*	
Appellant,	*	
	*	
V.	*	
	*	
SPO Cam; Erin Costanzo; Hardy;	*	
Estate of Sean Wissink; City of Des Moines; Scarlett - #4937,	*	
Monies, Scanett - #4937,	*	
Appellees.	*	
No. 08-2491		Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
No. 08-2491 ————————————————————————————————————	*	District Court for the
Darnell Allen Browder,	*	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
	*	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder, Appellant,	* * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder,	* * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder,  Appellant,  Darryl Browder,	* * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder, Appellant,	* * * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder,  Appellant,  Darryl Browder,	* * * * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder,  Appellant,  Darryl Browder,  Plaintiff,	* * * * * * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.
Darnell Allen Browder,  Appellant,  Darryl Browder,  Plaintiff,	* * * * * * * *	District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.

Appellate Case: 08-2492 Page: 1 Date Filed: 11/12/2009 Entry ID: 3604699

Submitted	: November
Appellees.	*
	*
Moines; Scarlett - #4937,	*
Estate of Sean Wissink; City of Des	*
SPO Cam; Erin Costanzo; Hardy;	*
	*
v.	*
	*
Appellants,	*
Diowaci,	*
Browder,	*
Darnell Allen Browder; Darryl	*
No. 08-2492	
Appellees.	*
,	*
Moines; Scarlett - #4937,	*

Submitted: November 6, 2009 Filed: November 12, 2009

\_\_\_\_\_

Before BYE, BOWMAN, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM.

Darryl Browder and Darnell Browder appeal the district court's<sup>1</sup> judgment dismissing their 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit upon an adverse jury verdict. For reversal, they revisit their complaint, challenge various evidentiary rulings, complain of other trial-related matters, and argue that certain defendants should not have been dismissed pursuant to the voluntary-dismissal motion of their appointed counsel (which we construe as an argument that counsel rendered ineffective assistance).

The Browders are not entitled to relief based upon any allegation that their counsel rendered ineffective assistance, *see Glick v. Henderson*, 855 F.2d 536, 541 (8th Cir. 1988). We do not review issues that are raised for the first time on appeal, *see Stone v. Harry*, 364 F.3d 912, 914 (8th Cir. 2004); and given the limited record before us, which does not include a trial transcript, we are unable to provide meaningful review of the remaining issues raised in the Browders' appeal brief, *see* Fed. R. App. P. 10(b)(1); *Schmid v. United Bhd. of Carpenters & Joiners of Am.*, 827 F.2d 384, 386 (8th Cir. 1987) (per curiam).

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment, *see* 8th Cir. R. 47B, and we deny all pending motions on appeal.

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Ross A. Walters, United States Magistrate Judge for the Southern District of Iowa, to whom the case was referred for final disposition by consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).